

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

375 Beale Street, Suite 510, San Francisco, California 94105 tel 415 352 3600 fax 888 348 5190
State of California | Gavin Newsom – Governor | info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov

August 4, 2022

TO: All Commissioners and Alternates

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Andrea Gaffney, Senior Bay Development Design Analyst (415/352-3643;
andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of the June 13, 2022, Virtual Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Meeting Procedure Review.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Jacinta McCann called the teleconference meeting to order on Zoom, at approximately 5:00 p.m.

Board Members in attendance included Board Chair Jacinta McCann, Board Vice Chair Gary Strang and Board Members Kristen Hall, Tom Leader, Stefan Pellegrini, Andrew Wolfram.

BCDC staff in attendance included Andrea Gaffney, Ashley Tomerlin, Shruti Sinha, Katharine Pan, and Ethan Lavine.

Other people in attendance included:

Estuary Park Panelists

- John Gibbs, WRT (in-person) - jgibbs@wrtdesign.com
- Jake Tobias, WRT (online) - jtobias@wrtdesign.com
- Chris Reed, Oakland Public Works (online) - creed2@oaklandca.gov
- Can Liu, WRT (online) – cliu@wrtdesign.com
- Jorgen Blomberg, ESA (online) - jblomberg@esassoc.com
- Priya Finnemore, ESA (online) - pfinnmore@esassoc.com

Peninsula Crossing at 1200-1340 Old Bayshore Highway Panelists

- Virginia Calkins, DivcoWest (in-person)
- Kevin Conger, CMG (in-person)
- Seth Bland (in-person)
- Ben Mickus (online)
- David Bowlby (online)
- Justin Aff (online)
- Dilip Trivedi, Moffet Nichol (online)

Ms. McCann briefly reviewed the meeting protocols.

2. Staff Update. Ms. Gaffney updated issues pertinent to the Board.

a. The office of legislative affairs has received the DRB regulation changes. Once approved, this means that the board positions will have term limits and we can appoint new members directly as alternates. The regulation reform began in the fall of 2018. There will be a full briefing on the changes for our next meeting, which will be in August.

b. The other two items on the agenda concern projects which the Board has reviewed in the past couple years.

(1) The Point Molate development project has been put on hold. However, the Point Molate Bay Trail is moving forward with the City and EBRPD.

(2) On June 30th, the Commission will hold a special meeting to vote on whether or not to remove the Port Priority Use designation at Howard Terminal. Removal of the port use is a requirement for the permit action concerning the mixed-use baseball park development.

3. Approval of Draft Meeting Minutes for March 7, 2022 (PDF) and March 21, 2022 (PDF). The Board decided to delay the review of the minutes until the next meeting.

4. First Review of Estuary Park Redevelopment in Oakland, Alameda County. The Design Review Board held its first pre-application review of the proposal by the City of Oakland to redevelop an 11-acre site at Estuary Park in the City of Oakland, Alameda County. The project proposes to create a major open space, expand recreational facilities, improve access to and enjoyment of the shoreline, implement an event-hosting program, and improve the San Francisco Bay Trail through the park.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Shruti Sinha provided a staff introduction to the project site and context.

b. **Project Presentation.** Jacob Tobias and John Gibbs, WRT provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of project goals, background, local context, existing site conditions, and a detailed description of the proposed project as updated since the previous Board meeting.

c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions to clarify the issues at hand.

d. Public Comment

(1) Lee Huo, Bay Trail/MTC. See attached email.

(2) William Threlfall, Estuary Park Plan Study Group. See attached email.

(3) Tom Horton, Jack London Aquatic Center (JLAC).

(a) The plan is creative and responsive to site users.

(b) While there is a derelict quality of the park, it is true that it's been underutilized and subject to degradation due to lack of maintenance, there is significant activity around JLAC which is unfortunately outside of the limit of work. Upwards of 400 youth and adult aquatic users regularly come to the site. The parking lot is completely full at times. It is a very active part of the park and will continue to be into the future. Aquatic activities, are and will continue to be one of the biggest draws to the site.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board discussed how the project addresses the seven objectives for public access found in the Public Access Design Guidelines as well as the following specific topics.

(1) Please advise on considerations for balancing special events and the general public's invitation and enjoyment of the waterfront park.

(2) Please advise on the proposed re-design for the southern waterfront with the Bay Trail shifted upland and the incorporation of the transition zone, gravel beach and tide pool structures.

The Board's comments are summarized in the following comments:

f. **Project's Limit of Work**

(1) The whole site needs to be considered as one facility. It is difficult to understand the full usership of the site with the current limit of work and the exclusion of JLAC. JLAC is a critical stakeholder; it feels like a missing part and it would be helpful to see even a diagrammatic connection for the Bay Trail and JLAC site. It would be helpful to see a Master Plan to understand how JLAC is used and how Bay Trail use is coordinated with boating events and aquatic uses.

(2) The southeast pier project seems unresolved with how the park elements are coming together. With the Halprin pergola, nature planting, and Bay Trail, there seems to be a missing opportunity at the pier corner. It should be celebrated as a pause point. The pier is a popular fishing spot, there's a lot going on in that turn in the Bay Trail – further study is needed for a cleaner transition at the corner.

(3) Recommend further study on the restroom building and boat storage area– could the restrooms be connected to JLAC building rather than independent? Does boat storage need to be there? The programs seem uncoordinated.

(a) **Park Design**

i. The turf area is large and will require a lot of water and maintenance to be kept in good shape. Review what can be done to reduce those needs as maintenance seems to be an issue with the condition of existing park.

ii. Make sure the park feels secure, that there is sufficient surveillance.

iii. Knowing the intense level of use, make sure materials reflect that need.

iv. Strengthen physical and programmatic connections between park and water access points – those programs seem too distinct from each other.

v. Commend all the different water edge conditions and the many ways to interact with the water. The design provides for every type of craft.

vi. Please present more details on furnishings and lighting at future review.

(b) Heritage Design

- i. Develop a more systematic analysis of the Halprin Design, respecting the cultural design heritage that can inform what elements need to be kept. The pergola is an interesting structure. There's an opportunity here. The picnic tables are special and give character and worth reconstructing in a similar way if they need to be replaced. There is an opportunity for interpretation of Halprin's work/presence here.
- ii. The Halprin seating steps are a fantastic element. Would need to adapt to accommodate accessible seating and shaded seating. There are sufficient trees to provide shade.

(c) Bay Trail and Bike/Pedestrian Circulation

- i. The Bay Trail alignment with the natural shoreline/planting is a positive contrasting experience from the hardened edge at Jack London Square.
- ii. The Bay Trail at the Northeast corner of the site is relatively new, there should be some effort made that Bay Trail is well signed and interpreted. Make sure it's legible and there is appropriate signage.
- iii. Coordinate boat uses (launching, storage area, boat trailers) with Bay Trail and other park users. It seems there are programmatic accommodations for water uses that need further study/development.
- iv. The 90-degree turn at the pier is a great cue to faster Bay Trail users to slow down. It would be great to see how that cue can be accentuated to help coordinate different user groups/speeds.
- v. Recommend more sidewalk connections to the Embarcadero. Most of the site access seem to be auto-oriented.

(d) Gatherings and Events

- i. Very large events such as music festivals are not really desirable because of the adjacent housing.
- ii. It's good the plaza can accommodate food trucks and other activations.
- iii. Events and rentals would be good for revenue generation.
- iv. Develop a plan for the proposed events and activations for the park. What are the events that can happen along this waterfront? With Jack London Square and Brooklyn Basin, is this site the best opportunity for events in this waterfront.

(e) Resilience

- i. Recommend building to 2100 and making sure the restroom building is resilient because that will be hard to adapt or change later.
- ii. Please describe the City's options for preserving more of the park and access to at least a portion of the park with the anticipated sea level rise.

g. **Applicant Response.** John Gibbs, WRT provided the following responses:

(1) JLAC's success is part of the reason it was not included. The rest of the park has been marginally successful. JLAC's functioning is clear. The budget is a limiting factor with the significant work that needs to happen for Sea Level Rise. The Bay Trail, parking areas, and JLAC are all functioning now so the priority is to improve the rest of the park.

(2) Community has prioritized activation and designing for longevity and maintenance. Simplicity and durability of materials will be important.

(3) Water use – there are active soccer programs that happen here, that's the justification for the lawn size and the necessary water use.

(4) Halprin – the earlier reviews/CEQA had minimized his design elements. Moving forward, it is included in this iteration and will be further documented to celebrate the historic landscape elements.

h. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board made the following summary and conclusions: The Board directed the project proponents to return for a second review.

5. **First Review of Peninsula Crossing at 1200-1340 Old Bayshore Highway in Burlingame, San Mateo County.** The Design Review Board held their first pre-application review of the proposal by DivCo West to redevelop the 12-acre site at 1200-1340 Old Bayshore Highway on the Anza Peninsula in the City of Burlingame, San Mateo County. The project proposes a 1.46 million gross square feet life sciences and office campus with three new office buildings and two new parking structures with public access improvements, including a new 1,475-foot-long segment Bay Trail segment, and other public access improvements near the Bay shoreline and along Easton Creek east of Old Bayshore Highway. The project will also involve raising site elevations approximately 7 feet and installing shoreline protection infrastructure to address future sea level rise conditions. The project property does not reach the Bay jurisdiction except at the Creek.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Katharine Pan provided a staff introduction to the project site and context.

b. **Project Presentation.** Seth Bland and Virginia Calkins, DivCo West gave a brief introduction and then introduced Kevin Conger, CMG. Mr. Conger provided an overview, with a slide presentation, of project goals, background, local context, existing site conditions, and a detailed description of the proposed project as updated since the previous Board meeting.

c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions to clarify the issues at hand.

d. **Public Comment.** Lee Huo, Bay Trail/MTC. See attached email.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board discussed how the project addresses the seven objectives for public access found in the Public Access Design Guidelines as well as the following specific topics:

(1) How does the project proposal result in public spaces that “feel public,” and does the project proposal allow for the shoreline to be enjoyed by the greatest number of people?

(2) Are there additional improvements that could improve the public access experience along the shoreline and the creek?

(3) Are the public access areas appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise in balance with ensuring high-quality public access opportunities?

The Board’s comments are summarized in the following comments:

f. Configuration of Buildings

(1) Buildings 2 and 3 are stepping into shoreline band and it diminishes the public’s experience at Easton Creek. The parking structures are pushing these buildings into the Shoreline band. Between Building 2 and 3 feels pinched with the creek running through and the circulation around it next to the buildings. The applicant needs to demonstrate how these encroachments are shoreline oriented and what the public will get out of these spaces. Widen the shoreline spaces so the area feels like a generous public space.

(2) The paths come very close to the buildings and the public spaces feel like forecourts/anterooms to the building entries rather than truly public spaces. Giving more space to the public programming, perhaps with fewer instances of programming, may make it feel more public.

(3) The elevation of the south parking structure has a long frontage along the Bay Trail that diminishes the experience. This is one of the best view opportunities and it is housing cars. Recommend scaling down south parking structure and moving more parking to the north parking structure, perhaps with an additional floor, so that as the site is built out, the actual need for parking can be assessed. This may allow for a smaller footprint at the south structure.

(4) Confirm this amount of onsite vehicle parking is necessary, now and anticipated for the future. The level of traffic would impact Bayshore Highway.

(5) The parking shuttle commitment is fantastic. Recommend looking at enhancements to bicycle and transit opportunities.

(6) Auto driveways as view corridors.

(a) Celebrate these by emphasizing the bay views and ensure they do not feel like a back entrance or utility corridors.

(b) If these are meant to provide pedestrian access, there needs to be more obvious pedestrian facilities – sidewalks, signage, and plantings. It feels very back of house. Maybe losing one of the auto access routes and widening Easton Creek could be a win.

(c) The buildings are tight on the sidewalks along Bayshore Highway; adding more planting buffer to support pedestrians would increase the quality of sidewalk experience.

g. Bay Trail

(1) The Bay Trail should be 18'-20' wide, 16' is too narrow. There are a lot of existing trail users in this area and just north, do not underestimate the level of use. Make sure there's enough space to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians.

(2) The bridge is great and should have a generous width.

(3) Bay Trail connections to adjacent sites are important.

(4) The café paving crossing the Bay Trail may encourage people to spill out onto the Bay Trail and create user conflict. The Bay Trail is too tight at the café and needs to be independent and unincumbered. The Bay Trail needs to be delineated with a lot of space or its own standard material like asphalt or concrete.

(a) Materials

i. Transparency of buildings shown from the Bay seems subtle in its reflection of the Bay. Recommend maintaining that transparency and level of detail while balancing with bird safe practices.

(b) Shoreline Design

i. Soft edge of shoreline is fantastic, being bold along the shoreline is great.

ii. Planting palette looks thoughtful and realistic.

iii. The southern inlet is an important node along the shoreline and is a good site for the cafe.

iv. The café is a good public use; it goes well with the inlet but more can be done to broaden the café zone while also respecting the Bay Trail use. This café space needs to feel public because much of the rest of the site will feel like a corporate campus.

(c) Public Shore Parking Spaces

i. Public Shore parking spaces located in structures do not feel public. Recommend looking for an opportunity to distribute a few parking spaces outside the structures.

ii. Wayfinding for Public Shore parking spaces will be necessary because they're hidden in the structures.

h. Applicant Response

(1) Will take directions to heart with geometry of buildings, Bay Trail needs, and the southern inlet. The primary view corridors are the south plaza and Easton creek. The other locations will inevitably feel secondary.

(2) Water fountains, bottle fill stations, and other trial amenities are easy enough to accommodate.

(3) Requested clarification on whether the programming is trying to do too much or just enough?

i. **Board Response.** Make the program areas feel more public. The size and location of some of the amenities may feel more like the front door/lobby of the building rather than an inviting public space. Giving a little more space or pulling them away from the building may help distinguish what is a public element and what is meant for a forecourt.

j. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board made the following summary and conclusions: The Board directed the project proponents to return for a second review.

6. **Adjournment.** Ms. McCann asked for a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Strang moved to adjourn the June 13, 2022, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Wolfram.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 5 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain with Board Members Hall, Leader, Wolfram, Board Vice Chair Strang, and Board Chair McCann voting approval.

There being no further business, Ms. McCann adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY
Senior Landscape Architect

Subject: Bay Trail Comments for the Estuary Park BCDC DRB Meeting on June 13, 2022

Date: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 at 6:02:34 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Lee Huo

To: Sinha, Shruti@BCDC, Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC

CC: Nicola Szibbo, Toshi Shepard-Ohta, Lily Brown, Joel Shaffer

Andrea and Shruti,

Please accept the following comments from the Bay Trail Program at ABAG/MTC regarding the Estuary Park Project and provide them to the BCDC Design Review Board members at the upcoming DRB meeting on June 13, 2022.

- 1. Bay Trail Connections:** There are several important bicycle/pedestrian bridge projects that are currently at various stages of planning and design in the area including the future Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Trail Connector Project that is proposed to connect near Estuary Park and the future Estuary Crossing Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge project connecting the City of Alameda with Oakland within the vicinity of Estuary Park. In addition, there will likely be improvements to the trails as part of any future Jack London Aquatic Center site improvements. As such, it will be critical to ensure that the Estuary Park project communicates with the project sponsors of these other projects to ensure that the design of the Estuary Park project will consider and accommodate the needs of these other project in order to create a seamless trail connection between the trails that will be constructed as part of these projects.
- 2. Bay Trail Capacity:** We appreciate the proposed 20-foot paved width of the proposed reconstructed Bay Trail. However, this area will have the potential for a very high level of use with the full development of the adjacent Brooklyn Basin Project as well as the development of the bicycle/pedestrian bridges for the Lake Merritt to Bay Trail Connector Project and the Alameda-Oakland Estuary Crossing. All of these projects will result in a high level of usage, and the Bay Trail constructed as part of the Estuary Park Project must consider the trail capacity needed to accommodate all of these future users. As result, we request that the DRB consider if the width of the proposed Bay Trail will be adequate to accommodate all of these future users.
- 3. Event and Gathering Impacts:** The proposed project includes the expected use of Estuary Park for future community events and the use of the proposed Event and Gathering Plaza as an event space. The design and planning of events at Estuary Park must ensure that regular access to the Bay Trail and through access along the Bay Trail is not impacted by the event activities planned at Estuary Park. We have particular concern regarding the planned Event and Gathering Plaza shown in the exhibits as this space acts as a part of the Bay Trail but is also planned as an event/gathering space that will also be utilized for Food Truck access. The event/gathering plaza must be designed to delineate a clear path for the Bay Trail and its users to maintain access along the Bay Trail.
- 4. Water Activity Impacts:** Although the proposed Estuary Project doesn't appear to propose any new activities that would require water activity users to cross the Bay Trail, we would like to reemphasize that any design should minimize the impacts of adjacent water activity uses on the Bay Trail by minimizing the crossing points to access launch facilities and storage facilities while clearly delineating areas where the crossings are needed along the Bay Trail.
- 5. Trail Amenities:** It appears that the existing public restroom will not be impacted and will continue to be accessible by Bay Trail users, however we would like to confirm that the new restroom facilities proposed with the Estuary Park project will also be fully public and accessible to Bay Trail users as the

staff report currently indicates that it is designed for use by the Jack London Aquatic Center. Other trail user amenities that should be considered as a part of this project include new bicycle parking, bicycle repair stations, and water fountain/bottle filling stations.

6. **Trail Design:** The proposed Bay Trail alignment includes a 90-degree turn at the southern corner of Estuary Park. The angle of this turn should be softened to allow for safe travel by bicyclists on the Bay Trail.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project, and let me know if you have any questions.

Lee Chien Huo
Bay Trail Planner
375 Beale Street, Suite 700
San Francisco, CA 94105-2066

Tel: (415) 820-7915
lhuc@bayareametro.gov
www.baytrail.org

From: William Threlfall <wthrelfall@pacbell.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 1:24 PM
To: BCDC PublicComment <publiccomment@bcdcc.ca.gov>
Cc: Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC <andrea.gaffney@bcdcc.ca.gov>
Subject: 6/13/2022: Item 4.

Some people who received this message don't often get email from wthrelfall@pacbell.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Board Chair McCann and members of the Design Review Board:

I am writing as chair of the Estuary Park Plan Study Group appointed by the Oakland Measure DD Community Coalition. The Study Group has developed a set of questions and comments about the emerging Estuary Park plan, seeking responses by City staff and contractors responsible for the plan. This document, first transmitted to City staff in January 2022, highlights our group's points of concern about the design and is the basis for an ongoing engagement between the DD Coalition and City staff about the plan.

For your consideration, I have attached this document, incorporating the most recent response from Christine Reed, Oakland Public Works Project Manager for the Estuary Park project.

William Threlfall
Chair, Estuary Park Plan Study Group
[Oakland Measure DD Community Coalition](#)

Estuary Park Renovation and Expansion - DD Coalition Comments and Response Summary

DD Coalition Comments received 1/19/22; update 6/03/22

Comments	Responsible Party	Response	Action Timeline
<p>1. Has the emerging design been reviewed with Richard Battersby, the Assistant Director of Public Works who has proven so crucial in the Coalition's effort to arrange repair of the DG pathway at Lake Merritt? It may be helpful to involve him.</p>	<p>City</p>	<p>The design of all Capital Improvement Projects involves close coordination with the two Divisions of OPW that Richard Battersby oversees: Parks and Tree Services (responsible for 'softscape' maintenance and trash collection within parks) and Facilities Services (maintenance of buildings, restrooms, play equipment and other structures). Key staff from these Divisions attend regular project Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings, review and approve plans and specifications. Richard Battersby is aware of this project and through his management oversight will ensure that our design team is apprised of the City's best practices for security-related design and specifications.</p>	<p>Ongoing Consultation with OPW Maintenance Services through Design Phase at milestone submittal reviews</p>
<p>2. Is there a need for the design process to include coordination with the City's Encampment Management Team?</p>	<p>City</p>	<p>The City's Encampment Management Team (EMT) is consulted when an action related to an encampment, such as clear and vacate, is required. OPW BDC (Bureau of Design and Construction) and BOE (Bureau of the Environment) have liaisons to the EMT that can be called upon if needed to coordinate. However, given the overwhelming pressures on the EMT, this interaction is typically limited to immediate and urgent need. As mentioned in the previous response, we will work closely with BOE representatives</p>	

		who are familiar with prevention/recurrence practices to advise on the design development.	
3. What can WRT tell us about other cities' urban park designs that may offer promising models to address the sorts of problems Oakland has experienced at our Measure DD parks? What can we learn?	WRT	<p>The design team will include a statement in the Master Plan Document Project Goals section to address how the design activates the park space to balance the range of users.</p> <p>As the design is further developed in the SD phase, the design team will conduct a review of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. The design of Estuary Park will be informed by these principles.</p> <p>Master Plan Document includes a to better address this aspect of the park design: "Create a welcoming, inclusive, and accessible space to increase civic collaboration, participation and mutual accountability among diverse users." The Design will be further developed during the SD phase to reflect this goal.</p>	
4. Are there particular design elements that seem likely to attract prohibited overnight use? (e.g. overhead shelter, electrical outlets, proximity of restrooms & water, food truck or picnic residue, etc.) Are design elements that might discourage prohibited overnight use being considered?	WRT	<p>The intent is that no particular design elements in the Master Plan encourage prohibited overnight use.</p> <p>During Schematic Design, the design team will further address the concern by designing open sightlines, providing lighting throughout the park, layering different programming elements, and encouraging natural surveillance.</p> <p>5/17/22: Refined Conceptual Plan presented to Coalition</p>	

		<p>5/16/22 illustrates solutions to these concerns.</p> <p>The design team will continue to work closely with Public Works park management and maintenance team to evaluate the design elements.</p>	
<p>5. Are there particular design elements that are especially vulnerable to misuse by the public? (irrigation, lighting, plantings, etc.) How can these be protected?</p>	WRT	<p>Landscape details will be designed with considerations of security and vandalism-protection. These will be further developed in the SD and CD stages, through engagement with Public Works maintenance staff for input on City BMPs.</p>	
<p>6. Are plantings proposed in areas vulnerable to off-path pedestrian traffic or occupancy?</p>	WRT	<p>Planting palette will be designed with considerations of public safety. It will be further developed in the CD stages.</p>	
<p>7. Will the extensive grass areas shown in the conceptual design yield significant problems from Canada Geese? If yes, how might the issue be managed? By whom?</p>	City / WRT	<p>Long-term management of the park will be shared by OPRD (programming and activation) and OPW Park Services (lawn and planting maintenance). Effective solutions from design standpoint fall into three categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site aversion (i.e., encouraging programs and uses that are deterrent to geese). 2. Off-leash dog park—Estuary Park is an off-leash dog park. 3. Smaller size of lawn – not possible given Estuary Park program. 	

<p>8. Is the expected life of key materials known? (e.g. paving, shoreline treatments, seating, plantings, irrigation and lighting systems?)</p>	<p>WRT</p>	<p>Site Furnishings, planting palette and materials will be designed with considerations of durability. Those items will be defined in the SD and CD stages in consultation with Public Works maintenance staff.</p>	
<p>9. At what point in the phasing plan is construction of the Kayak soft-launch facility (#14) planned? Will other public launch facilities be renovated or added? As this is a waterfront park, public launch seems a keystone element.</p>	<p>WRT</p>	<p>The design currently prioritizes improvements to the south shoreline, which will be included in Phase 1 of construction. The proposed coarse-grained beach would provide water access and possible launch/landing opportunities for small craft.</p> <p>The existing boat ramps near the JLAC will not be altered as part of this project.</p> <p>Known public launch facilities to remain will be labeled in the Master Plan. Another kayak soft launch facility near JLAC is proposed in the Conceptual Master Plan. Additional grant funding may allow for the construction of this soft launch location in Phase 1.</p>	
<p>10. How does the design reflect the public feedback from the October 23, 2021 public workshop and survey? The online survey summary mentions as top concerns: “concerns regarding safety and property crimes and potential mitigations...” How are these concerns being addressed in the emerging design?</p>	<p>WRT</p>	<p>The Master Plan Document Project Goals section addresses how the design activates the park space and provides solutions to the public safety concerns.</p> <p>As the design is further developed in the SD stage, the design team will analyze and incorporate spatial design and programming strategies that can increase safety.</p> <p>5/17/22: Refined Conceptual Plan presented to Coalition 5/16/22 illustrates solutions to these concerns.</p>	<p>.</p>

<p>11. City staff have mentioned “park activation” as a strategy to avoid misuse and problems like those encountered at Lake Merritt and Union Point Park. What is planned? What resources have been committed? Who will be responsible? How will this differ from practices at Lake Merritt and Union Point Park?</p>	<p>City</p>	<p>Park programming is led by OPRYD. They organize and manage regular use as well as special events within the City’s parks. OPRYD is committed to developing regular programming and planned events at Estuary Park that will activate and expand public awareness of the park. Additionally, informal ‘activation’ is achieved through the provision of attractive amenities that draw park users at all times of day, throughout the week and year. The design team has deliberately planned attractive amenities, such as dog park, picnic and play areas, water sport facilities, etc. to ensure this type of informal activation.</p> <p>Estuary Park is situated within easy walking distance of Jack London Square, has an active presence in the JLAC and Boating Program, is flanked by residential housing, with more planned to come in the immediate neighborhood. This sets it apart from Union Point Park, which suffered from disconnection and lack of visibility.</p>	
<p>12. Public restrooms: Let’s discuss issues, policies, operational plans access, and maintenance.</p>	<p>City</p>	<p>The Design team is actively consulting Public Works maintenance staff with extensive experience installation and maintenance of restroom facilities to advise on restroom design.</p>	

13. How does the design reflect the history of the site? Is interpretive signage planned?	WRT	<p>The design team will incorporate influences from the site history to inform the design language (materials, forms, furnishings) of the park.</p> <p>The design will indicate proposed locations for interpretive signage in the detailed design phase as part of the overall site furnishing strategy. Interpretive signage design is not part of the WRT design scope, but could be provided under separate contract.</p> <p>Coastal Conservancy grant funding is being pursued that could cover the costs of interpretive signage design and installation associated with the shoreline design.</p>	To be further developed during the SD and CD phases.
14. What has made Township Park (aka Shoreline Park) so popular with the public? What are the implications for the design of Estuary Park?	WRT	<p>The design has been informed by our understanding of adjacent successful open spaces. We have studied Township Commons and other open spaces particularly for guidance on roller skating and skateboarding. The intent of the design is to apply similar activation strategies while adding new uses to encourage their success. We will continue to study adjacent successful open spaces for lessons to apply.</p>	
15. What are the design (e.g., fencing, locked gates) and operational (e.g., limited hours of operation) measures that the City employed, in the case of Union Point Park, to bring itself into compliance with the requirements of its BCDC permit and cease and desist order to achieve the intended effects of	City	<p>Response from Richard Battersby: My understanding is that OPW Facilities is tasked only with restoring UPP to the pre-existing condition, and any actions taken to prevent or limit the return to the unacceptable conditions will be through monitoring and enforcement which falls outside the purview of OPW other than reporting any future intrusions/activities to OPD and/or the Encampment</p>	

removing and preventing resumption of inappropriate (e.g., residential) uses? To what extent is the City considering these measures for incorporation into the planning for and operation of Estuary Park?		<p>Management Team. That being said, we did restore the restrooms and included hardened security equipment to help prevent future break-ins, and as access and locking mechanisms are replaced we deploy the best available options. I am not aware of any plans to add or improve fencing at Union Point Park.</p> <p>Response from Chris: Per the response to comment #1 above, we will collaborate closely with OPW maintenance staff to ensure that detailing of all elements of the park subject to vandalism 'deploy the best available options' in terms of durability and deterrence. The Boat Storage areas will be secured with fencing, and the restrooms will have locks.</p>	
16. What are the design and operational (e.g., resources unique to the private ownership status of Township Commons?) measures that have enabled Township Commons to enjoy freedom from the inappropriate use problems that have afflicted Union Point Park and Mosswood Park? To what extent is the City considering these measures, or their public ownership equivalent, for incorporation into the planning for and operation of Estuary Park?	City	<p>The Township Commons has benefitted from a private security presence hired by the Brooklyn Basin homeowner's association. Ownership of the Commons transferred to the City of Oakland in October 2021. BBD will continue to maintain the park for two years after transfer, per the terms of the Development agreement, then the parks will be maintained with additional maintenance funding via the Community Facility District (CFD). Private security is not an eligible expense for the CFD.</p>	

<p>(recv'd 1/7/22 through Kristin Hathaway) What entity holds responsibility for future maintenance of Estuary Park? The 2006 Brooklyn Basin Development Agreement assigns the maintenance responsibility to the Brooklyn Basin Community Service District. We wish to be sure that no subsequent amendment has changed this agreement:</p>	<p>City</p>	<p>Through the Brooklyn Basin Development agreement, a Community Facility District (CFD) has been formed that will collect tax revenue for Estuary Park maintenance upon completion of the new improvements and expansion to an 11 acre park. CFD is a taxing entity with no obligation or ability to deliver maintenance.</p> <p>Since the development agreement was originally developed, it has been determined that the Community Services District (CSD) described in the DA that had an obligation to maintain the park is not compatible with State Law. (CSD typically used in unincorporated areas)</p> <p>The City Attorney and Developer are currently exploring alternative arrangements for how the tax collected maintenance revenue will be administered to maintain Estuary Park. The City and Developer are aligned with mutual interest in the long-term maintenance of park quality.</p> <p>The Developer's responsibility for maintaining the parks that they implement (within BBD) is limited to two years after the parks are transferred to the City. This does not include Estuary Park.</p>	
---	-------------	---	--

Comments from James Vann received 1/8/22

Comments	Responsible Party	Response	Action Timeline
----------	-------------------	----------	-----------------

17. The area north-to-south along the West boundary (12) (adjacent to the existing residential development) should be a water capture and runoff retention area and should form a functionally natural boundary separating the 2 distinct uses.	WRT	Yes, agreed and confirmed that is the intent of the design. Note that the teal colored zones throughout the plan indicate stormwater capture and infiltration areas. See 'Refined Conceptual Plan' presented to Coalition 5/16/22	
18. Consider exchanging the areas of the "Dog Park" (4) and the "Small Multi-Purpose Lawn" (3). The north end of the "Small Multi-Purpose Lawn" should have a broadly visible and inviting expanse facing the parking area (16) and public entryway (extension of 8), opening up to the major Park elements to the south; whereas the "Dog Park" (4) should have reduced frontage to the parking area and public entryway	WRT	We agree that open views from the park entrance to the water are important. The current organization of the park around a continuous swath of lawn from entry (northwest corner of the park) to waterfront is intended to maximize the view of the estuary and the entire park from the point of entry at Embarcadero. See 'Refined Conceptual Plan' presented to Coalition 5/16/22	
19. Enlarge the "Food Truck" area (adjacent to SW edge of the Parking area (16)). Lacking an integrated cafe, the Food Truck area will be popular and heavily trafficked. Assure that adequate spaces and related maneuverability is provided.	WRT	WRT has confirmed that there is adequate space and turning-radius dimensions for various arrangements of food trucks, including the southwestern edge of the parking area and in the event plaza south of the JLAC building. Food trucks could also occupy the space between the JLAC building and the new boat-storage area/restroom building.	
20. Relocate the "Picnic Area" (now near 3) to be more closely related to the Food Truck area (after its relocation).	WRT	A picnic area is located directly adjacent to the food-truck area at the northwest corner of the park. Picnic tables will also be provided under the existing pergola, close to the event plaza where food trucks can be located during events.	

<p>21. The “Kayak Launch Area” (14) does not acknowledge the existing racing boat activity associated with, and emanating from the Lake Merritt Aquatic Center. Assure that both functions are adequately separated to function independently.</p>	<p>WRT</p>	<p>OPRYD and boating community stakeholders have been and will continue to be consulted to advise on the design of the boating facilities and support areas.</p> <p>Existing public boat-launch facilities currently coexist with the rowing programs. Existing public boat-launch facilities will continue to be located near the JLAC, as required by the terms of the JLAC permit that requires maintenance of public access. This will need to be managed by the boating programs.</p> <p>The southern shore will provide an alternative soft-launch location, however this is far from the parking areas.</p>	
<p>22. The main pathway from the Parking Area (extension of 8) to the major Park elements runs between the “Dog Park (4, before its relocation),” (or, the “Small Multi-Purpose Lawn” (3, before its relocation), and bisects the Boat Storage Building (5) from its related JLAC Bldg. Move the Boat Storage Building (5) to be adjacent to its related JLAC Bldg and relate the main Park pathway to run adjacent to, and along the easterly edge of the “Small Multi-Purpose Lawn” (3, after its relocation).</p>	<p>WRT</p>	<p>The boat storage and restroom buildings cannot be placed over the EBMUD easement indicated by the dashed red lines. This is driving their location just beyond the western edge of the easement.</p> <p>Refined Conceptual Plan presented to Coalition 5/16/22 illustrates solutions to these concerns.</p>	

<p>23. The holding area for the 60' ft racing boats (17) should be configured as an extension of, or as an "overflow parking area."</p>	<p>WRT</p>	<p>Reconfiguration of the parking area north of the JLAC is not in Phase 1. The rowing operations will continue to function as they currently do, with the additional boat storage and shower facility. The space between the JLAC building and the boat-storage facility will be significantly increased; this space could potentially be used as lay-down area for rowing shells.</p>	
<p>24. The boat launch access as shown from Embarcadero to the water (at the SE corner (near 17)) is not correct and, as shown, is not workable. This area must be well designed and thought-out including maneuverable space and related parking.</p>	<p>WRT</p>	<p>The boat launch access is shown at the existing location. The maneuver space and parking have been studied by the design team to make sure enough space is provided for trailers and boats. Minor restriping of the parking area north of the JLAC building may be required to provide turning room for the largest vehicle and trailer (Coast Guard) that needs to access the boat ramp.</p>	
<p>25. The existing and recently constructed "Restroom Bldg" (at Embarcadero (near 17)) must be shown and integrated in the Plan.</p>	<p>WRT</p>	<p>The existing restroom building is shown and now labeled on the plan. The existing structures to remain (including the JLAC building and EBMUD pump station) are now labeled on the plan.</p>	

From: William Threlfall <wthrelfall@pacbell.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 2:39 PM
To: BCDC PublicComment <publiccomment@bcdcc.ca.gov>
Subject: SUBJECT: 6/13/2022: Item 4.

Board Chair McCann and members of the Design Review Board:

I offer two comments regarding the Estuary Park plan now before you.

Public Launch

As this is a waterfront park, public launch seems a keystone element, and I urge more attention to this need which is not well-met elsewhere in the Brooklyn Basin Development.

I believe that the current design of the park fails to properly address the guidance from San Francisco Bay Plan Recreation Policy No 3 pertaining to incorporating access facilities for non-motorized small-boats. Policy No. 3 also calls for additional launching facilities around the Bay shoreline, *especially where there are few existing facilities*. Note that within the entire Brooklyn Basin complex, existing approved project plans include no such launch facilities.

In addition, it is not consistent with Recreation Policy No. 4 which calls for public launching facilities in waterfront parks where feasible. The existing dock primarily serves programs at the nearby Jack London Aquatic Center rather than the general public.

Resilient Design

The park design should anticipate and address the need to preserve public access and to protect park improvements against public misuse.

The City of Oakland has a demonstrated inability to manage the problem of encampments near water, and the Estuary Park design and operational plans should reflect that inability. Otherwise, the new park may become a venue repeating the problems and misuse observed at Lake Merritt and Union Point Park.

While park design can only do so much to address such problems, I urge support of whatever can be achieved through thoughtful, forward-looking design.

Thank you for considering this input.

William Threlfall
Oakland, CA

From: Lee Huo
Sent: Thursday, June 9, 2022 10:26 AM
To: Pan, Katharine@bcdcc; Gaffney, Andrea@bcdcc
cc: Toshi Shepard-Ohta; Nicola Szibbo; Lilly Brown; Joel Shaffer
Subject: RE: Bay Trail Comments on the Peninsula Crossing Project - BCDC DRB Meeting on June 13, 2022

From: Pan, Katharine@BCDC <katharine.pan@bcdcc.ca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 9, 2022 9:26 AM
To: Lee Huo <luo@bayareametro.gov>; Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC <andrea.gaffney@bcdcc.ca.gov>
Cc: Toshi Shepard-Ohta <tshepard-ohta@bayareametro.gov>; Nicola Szibbo <nszibbo@bayareametro.gov>; Lily Brown <lbrown@bayareametro.gov>; Joel Shaffer <jshaffer@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Re: Bay Trail Comments on the Peninsula Crossing Project - BCDC DRB Meeting on June 13, 2022

External Email

Thank you for your comments, Lee, we'll share them with the Board for Monday's meeting.

Katharine Pan

Principal Shoreline Development Analyst

Direct: (415) 352-3650 | katharine.pan@bcdcc.ca.gov

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, Ste. 510
San Francisco, CA 94105
Main: (415) 352-3600
www.bcdcc.ca.gov | [@SFBCCDC](https://twitter.com/SFBCCDC)

From: Lee Huo <luo@bayareametro.gov>
Date: Wednesday, June 8, 2022 at 4:14 PM
To: Gaffney, Andrea@BCDC <andrea.gaffney@bcdcc.ca.gov>, Pan, Katharine@BCDC <katharine.pan@bcdcc.ca.gov>
Cc: Toshi Shepard-Ohta <tshepard-ohta@bayareametro.gov>, Nicola Szibbo <nszibbo@bayareametro.gov>, Lily Brown <lbrown@bayareametro.gov>, Joel Shaffer <jshaffer@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Bay Trail Comments on the Peninsula Crossing Project - BCDC DRB Meeting on June 13, 2022

Andrea and Katharine,

Please accept the following comments from the Bay Trail Program at ABAG/MTC regarding the Peninsula Crossing Project and provide them to the BCDC Design Review Board members at the upcoming DRB meeting on June 13, 2022.

- 1) **Bay Trail Width/Capacity:** The proposed Bay Trail appears to range in width between 16 feet, 18 feet, and 20 feet. There are currently a significant amount of proposed projects within this area of the Burlingame's shoreline. As a result, we request that the width of the trail be designed in consideration of the expected level use that will be needed as a result of all of the development within the area as well as the capacity needed to accommodate the level of Bay Trail users once the entirety of the Bay Trail is completed. Width acts as capacity on trails and narrowing areas can act as bottlenecks. We request that the trail widths be as consistent as feasible.
- 2) **Easton Creek Bridge:** We appreciate that a bridge is proposed over Easton Creek to accommodate the Bay Trail. We would like to confirm that it will accommodate both pedestrian and bicyclists since it is identified as only a pedestrian bridge. We would also request that the width/capacity of the bike/pedestrian bridge match the rest of the proposed Bay Trail.
- 3) **Outdoor Café:** The proposed outdoor café is directly adjacent to the proposed Bay Trail, and we would like to ensure that the seating and circulation of the café is designed to avoid any impacts on the Bay Trail and avoids impeding the travel of trail users along the Bay Trail.
- 4) **Trail Amenities:** We appreciate that the proposed project will incorporate many positive amenities for Bay Trail users including new bicycle parking, a bicycle repair station, a bike share station, and interpretive signage. We would also ask that the project sponsors consider adding a water fountain/bottle filling station.
- 5) **Trail Design:** The proposed Bay Trail alignment includes several hard angles along the southern portion of the project site. We would request that the Bay Trail alignment be designed with softened turns and curves to allow for safe travel by bicyclists on the Bay Trail.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project, and let me know if you have any questions.

Lee Chien Huo
Bay Trail Planner
375 Beale Street, Suite 700
San Francisco, CA 94105-2066
Tel: (415) 820-7915

From: William Threlfall
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2022 2:39 PM
To: BCDC PublicComment
Subject: SUBJECT: 6/13/2022: Item 4.

Some people who received this message don't often get email from wthrelfall@pacbell.net.
Learn why this is important

Board Chair McCann and members of the Design Review Board:

I offer two comments regarding the Estuary Park plan now before you.

Public Launch

As this is a waterfront park, public launch seems a keystone element, and I urge more attention to this need which is not well-met elsewhere in the Brooklyn Basin Development.

I believe that the current design of the park fails to properly address the guidance from San Francisco Bay Plan Recreation Policy No 3 pertaining to incorporating access facilities for non-motorized small-boats. Policy No. 3 also calls for additional launching facilities around the Bay shoreline, *especially where there are few existing facilities*. Note that within the entire Brooklyn Basin complex, existing approved project plans include no such launch facilities.

In addition, it is not consistent with Recreation Policy No. 4 which calls for public launching facilities in waterfront parks where feasible. The existing dock primarily serves programs at the nearby Jack London Aquatic Center rather than the general public.

Resilient Design

The park design should anticipate and address the need to preserve public access and to protect park improvements against public misuse.

The City of Oakland has a demonstrated inability to manage the problem of encampments near water, and the Estuary Park design and operational plans should reflect that inability. Otherwise, the new park may become a venue repeating the problems and misuse observed at Lake Merritt and Union Point Park.

While park design can only do so much to address such problems, I urge support of whatever can be achieved through thoughtful, forward-looking design.

Thank you for considering this input.

William Threlfall
Oakland, CA